From: BJ Miller
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2004 9:42 AM
To: Sumi, David
Cc: B160_proj_team
Subject: Re: Chapter 6 Tables Workshop Jan. 21 | 1:30 to 4:30

Friends,

In preparation for today's call, I would like to offer some suggestions for tables 6-1 through 6-4. These suggestions arose from a conversation I had with Anisa yesterday evening.

I think that in these four tables, which may be all most people look at, we are trying to present the following information:

1) Our recommendations and the most important features of each recommendation.

2) A description of what is required to carry out each of these recommendation, that is, who has to act and what processes have to be carried out.

3) The major problems that must be dealt with to carry out each recommendation, including the problems that may not occur at one level of intensity but would occur at higher levels.

Table 6-1 should cover item 1 above, that is, what we are recommending and the major features of each recommendation. I think that the items in this table are "actions," not strategies. To me, a strategy would be something like "focus almost exclusively on efficiency improvements to make supplies and needs match." That is, a "strategy" would be a grouping or emphasis on particular actions.

I also think that the actions in this table should be segregated for ease of understanding what we are recommending. Several of the actions are things that directly and significantly affect (not "impact") supplies and needs for water. These are the actions that directly increase supplies or reduce demand:

Agricultural Water Use Efficiency
Conjunctive Management & Groundwater Storage
Conveyance
Desalination (Brackish Water)
Recycled Municipal Water
System Reoperation
Urban Water Use Efficiency
Water Transfers
Precipitation Enhancement
Surface Storage

I include conveyance because I think that some conveyance can produce water.

These supply-demand actions are the ones that many people will pay most attention to. People will want to know what these numbers are, what they mean, and do they add up to produce a sufficient, reliable supply of water for all needs through the year 2030.

Other actions on this table are also important and must be included in a plan for managing the state's water. Some of these actions, while essential, either do not significantly affect supply and demand or affect supply and demand in indirect or unquantifiable ways. These are:

Agricultural Lands Stewardship
Aquifer Remediation
Drinking Water Treatment & Distribution
Ecosystem Restoration
Floodplain Management
Pollution Prevention
Recharge Area Protection
Water-Dependent Recreation
Watershed Management

If any of these actions would have a significant, quantifiable effect on supply or demand, they should be moved to the first list.

A third set of actions are those that are required in order to do the things on the first two lists. These actions are:

Statewide Water Planning
Regional Integrated Resource Planning & Management
Economic Incentives Policy
Matching Water Quality to its Use
Urban Land Use Management
Data & Tool Improvement
Science

I would not fall on my sword over shifting some of these actions from one list to another, but it does seem to me that, now, we are mixing, in a confusing way, actions of three distinctively different kinds.

For the items in the first list, the table should include the range of costs and the water produced.

For items in all three lists, I would replace all the dots with a brief narrative that described the action and why it is important.

As for Tables 6-2 through 6-4, I would replace them with a one- to two-paragraph discussion of each action covering the following points:

Which agencies would have primary responsibility for carrying out the action, including funding? What steps or processes would have to be gone through to carry out the action?

What problems, including funding, might be anticipated and what would have to happen, including federal/state assistance, to overcome those problems?

(I am not a big fan of "challenges." I think it is a euphemism, used by those who want to give the impression that there are no problems. To me, a challenge just may be something you have to do in the normal course of business. A "problem" is, well, a problem. It takes special attention and unusual effort to overcome. Where there are problems, I think we want people to know about them.)

This brief discussion should also describe the differences between carrying out a water supply-demand action at a low level of intensity versus carrying it out at a high level. If this distinction in levels of intensity is appropriate for other actions, it should be described for those actions as well.

The discussions should be keyed, one-on-one, to the table.

So, we would end up with a table and an accompanying narrative that would answer, in a general way, the following questions:

What should we do to provide the state with a sufficient, reliable supply of water?
What else should we do to manage the state's water and water-related features in a responsible way?
Who is responsible and what steps must be carried out?
How will we pay for this?
What problems will have to be overcome and how can that be done?

I also think that there should be an accompanying discussion of the ranges in supply-demand estimates. For example, if we have the high range in efficiency, what are the implications for transfers and storage? If transfers are high, what effects will that have on agriculture?

BJ